

## REMARKS

Claims have been carefully reviewed in light the Examiner's action.

After a personal interview with the Examiner on March 8, 2007, claims 14 and 23, and 28-32 have been amended in agreement with the Examiner, due to incomplete wording, which did not restrict location of the rollers.

Independent claims 28-31 are rejected by the Examiner, as being unpatentable over Kejha ( US Patent # 5,443,606) and Browrigg ( US Patent # 3,606,411).

As it was explained during the interview and in the prior Amendment of March 24, 2006 (page 9, lines 18-21), the major difference from the prior art is in controlling the web speed before the dip-coating, by using driven (metering) rollers before said dip-coating. (Sequential second step, line 4 of each claim 28-31).

Applicants agree with the Examiner, that the word " before "(dip-coating) was missing and thus these claims did not restrict the location of the nip-rollers. This restriction has been now added into these claims.

Controlling the web speed before dip-coating provides for no fluctuation of the web speed, and the steady web speed is critical for achieving the uniform coating thickness.

Also, this way the nip-rollers do not touch the coating, and thus can not damage the coating layers. The winding of the web onto the spool by using an overdrive with a slip clutch is secondary.

Prior art of Kejha controls the speed of the web by winding the web onto a spool, which is constantly changing the diameter of the spool, and consequently the RPM of the spool must be constantly varied to compensate for this change, resulting in the web speed fluctuation and thus non-uniform thickness of coating.

Prior art of Browrigg cited by the Examiner has a slip clutch driving the feeding nip-rollers of the web into a grid stretching machine. Applicant's coater does not have a slip clutch for driving the nip-rollers to control the speed of the web, but it has a direct, "hard" drive of nip-rollers, to ensure no slipping and thus no speed fluctuation, which is different from Browrigg.

The now corrected sequential steps of claims 28-31 are supported by the Specification (Page 9, lines 20-25 and Page 10, lines 1-2 and 14-26, and Page 11, lines 12-13, and by Drawings Fig. 1 and Fig. 8).

Dependent claims 14 and 23 have a unique feature of pulling and drying the web immediately horizontally over a roller, after dipping, which is not described in prior art. (See Specification, Page 13, lines 16-25, and Drawing Fig. 8). The word "sequentially" was added into the claims to make them allowable.

Applicants believe, that this invention embodies unique improvement of electrodes' coating over the prior art.

It was agreed during the interview, that claims 14 and 23, and 28-31 may be allowed, if amended as described, pending further search into the dip-coating methods of electrodes for lithium based electrochemical devices and capacitors only.

Because all remaining claims 5-8, 10-13 and 21-22 are directly or indirectly dependent on claims 28-31, they should be also allowed, even if their features are known.

It is believed that the claims define new and unobvious subject matter,

Accordingly, it is believed that the Amendment places the Application in condition for allowance and such action is requested and urged.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Joseph B. Kejha", with a long, sweeping horizontal stroke extending to the right.

Joseph B. Kejha  
(applicant)